

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application. By the amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 6, on page 2 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with various dependent claims are rejected as being unpatentable over WO 00/49769 (Lecheler et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,041,349 (Sugauchi et al.). In numbered paragraph 18, on page 5 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with various dependent claims are rejected as being unpatentable over Hewlett-Packard's commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,948,055 (Pulsipher et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,076,114 (Wesley). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed at least one collection computer relating to a management domain identifier. As exemplified in Fig. 1, one or more collection stations can be designated as a management domain (e.g., paragraph [0020]). Additional support for the recited management domain identifier and its trust flag may be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0031]-[0033]. For example, the management domain identifier can be resolved at a management station, the decision to recompute the management domain identifier being based on the trust flag (e.g., paragraph [0030]).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claims 1 and 8, which recite, among other features, information from at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier, the at least one management computer being

capable of selectively resolving the management domain identifier based on the trust flag.

The Examiner admits at paragraph 8 of the Office Action that "Lecheler did not expressly teach a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier" and admits at paragraph 20 of the Office Action that "Pulsipher did not expressly teach a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier." The Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent do not teach or suggest information from at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier, the at least one management computer being capable of selectively resolving the management domain identifier based on the trust flag, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

The Sugauchi et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Lecheler publication. The Sugauchi et al. patent was applied for its disclosure of a domain having a trust relation being obtained from a related domain 711 information, a display symbol 905 being generated for the domain having a trust relation as shown in Fig. 9 (col. 7, lines 28-35). However, the Sugauchi et al. patent is silent as to problem of resolving a management domain identifier at a management computer, and the Sugauchi et al. patent does not teach or suggest the at least one management computer capable of selectively resolving the management domain identifier based on the trust flag, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

The Wesley patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Pulsipher et al. patent. The Wesley patent was applied for its disclosure of a trust flag relating to a communication link, thus "if the receiving station indicates that the sending station can 'trust' the communication link, the sending station can adjust the expected RTT

and trust factor accordingly" (col. 9, lines 31-42). The RTT as disclosed refers to round trip time (col. 7, line 61). However, the Wesley patent is silent as to problem of resolving a management domain identifier at a management computer, and the Wesley patent does not teach or suggest the at least one management computer capable of selectively resolving the management domain identifier based on the trust flag, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent, individually or in combination with the Sugauchi et al. patent and/or the Wesley patent. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC



Date: November 8, 2005

By: _____



Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620